

## REMARKS

### INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the foregoing, claim 1 has been amended. Claims 1 and 4-10 are pending and under consideration.

### CLAIM REJECTIONS

Claims 6-10 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Thorland et al. (US 6,457,071) (hereinafter "Thorland").

Claims 1, 4 and 5 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thorland.

Thorland discloses a system and method for determining connection accuracy at an interface. The system and method of Thorland includes a host computer 100, a peripheral device 200, and a connection cable 201. Thorland, 5:12-5:15.

In Thorland, the inputs to the peripheral device attached to the conductive lines leading to the connector are all or substantially all bidirectional. During power-up of the system, each line is electrically tri-stated, meaning that the lines are in a high impedance state and neither sink nor source power to any device. When the peripheral is powered up for the first time, these lines, or a portion of the lines, would go into "input-only" mode and present a high impedance connection to the communications bus. Presenting a high impedance connection to the bus prevents any adverse effect on the bus, such as corruption of data thereon. Thorland, 7:21-7:32.

Further in Thorland, the peripheral device could transmit the identification information along one or more selected wires, and the host computer would perform detection so as to locate the expected signal among the wires coming into the host computer side of the connection which may be a motherboard. Thorland, 7:49-7:54.

According to the method of Thorland, in an uncommunicative condition, the host, after a certain period of time, will conclude that the connector is either entirely absent, or connected far from its proper position and can display a message to the user indicating this finding. The peripheral device, being unable to locate an identifying feature on any incoming line may also communicate the lack of connection directly to the user. Such communication can comprise the use of "blink codes" which cause an LED or other light on the peripheral to turn on and off a

fixed number of times, or to turn on a dedicated hazard light specifically indicating a lack of connection to the host. Thorland, 9:18-9:29.

**Claims 1, 4 and 5**

Amended claim 1 recites: "...a controller that sets a flag to check the connection state of the input/output cable, when power is applied to the AT Attachment Packet Interface (ATAPI) drive, and outputs a signal to the timer to increase a time counter, when a command is not received from the host for a predetermined period of time after the flag is set, and outputs the control signal to the indicator to indicate that the input/output cable is not connected to the host when the increased time exceeds a reference time..." Support for this amendment may be found in at least paragraph [0019] of the specification of the present application. It is respectfully submitted that Thorland does not discuss the feature of claim 1 of a controller that outputs a signal to the timer to increase a time counter.

Claims 4 and 5 depend on claim 1 and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the foregoing reason.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

**Claims 6-10**

Claim 6 recites: "...if a command is not received from the host for a predetermined period of time after the flag is set, commanding a timer to increase a time counter..." The Office Action relies on the discussion in Thorland where in an uncommunicative condition, the host, after a certain period of time, will conclude that the connector is either entirely absent, or connected far from its proper position and can display a message to the user indicating this finding. This section of Thorland appears to discuss the feature of claim 6 of "if a command is not received from the host for a predetermined period of time after the flag is set." However, the "certain period of time" of Thorland does not anticipate "commanding a timer to increase a time counter" which is additionally recited in claim 6.

An anticipation rejection requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each element of the claim under consideration. As such, anticipation will not be found when the prior art is lacking or missing a specific feature of the claimed invention. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the feature of claim 6 of commanding a timer to increase a time counter patentably distinguishes over Thorland.

Claims 7-10 depend on claim 6 and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

**CONCLUSION**

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: Nov 30, 2006

By: Gregory W. Harper  
Gregory W. Harper  
Registration No. 55,248

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., Seventh Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501